

## Leader among Equals: The 'School' of Bomberg in Context

Kate Aspinall

### Introduction

I was very pleased to notice a great change in your views on life and can never remember seeing you look so pleased with life as you did the other night – it seems that teaching has brought you peace of mind and satisfaction to your spirit ...you will shortly reach your true zenith which lies in your power to pass on your very fine knowledge to the initiated and also the unsophisticated – as David I think that will be your truer vocation.<sup>1</sup>

This double-edged praise was written to David Bomberg by Arthur Stambois, a collector of his work, in a letter of July 1945. It is clear from many accounts, including Bomberg's writings now held at Tate Britain, that he devoted himself to the craft of teaching in later life with all the intentness of purpose that earlier in life he devoted to avant-garde art. And just as he had done for painting in Britain in the 1910s, so too did he push the bounds of teaching in the 1950s. It is apt, therefore, that this exhibition is called *David Bomberg and the Art of Radical Teaching*.

In this talk, I will explore Bomberg's teachings from three angles – how he came to it, how his classes were structured, and what he taught – before moving on to consider Bomberg's class against other examples at a tumultuous moment for British art education. Understanding both the cultural context for these classes and how classmates related to each other can help us understand the unique climate Bomberg created and why this touched a nerve in the wider society. As we progress, I want to put forth the contention that Bomberg's class was more like a Renaissance 'school', and, that this radical environment confronted the fashionable image that artists were solitary rebels.

### Bomberg's Turn to Teaching

David Bomberg is one of the giants of twentieth century modernism in Britain. He achieved early success for his cubo-futurist treatment of figure compositions, such as *In the Hold* of 1913 to 14 and his early masterpiece, *Mud Bath* of 1914.<sup>2</sup> And though by personality, he was an individualist, as a young man, he touched, be it lightly or substantively, on a number of iconic artistic communities – from his youth with the 'Whitechapel Boys' to his studying within an exceptional generation at the Slade in 1911 to 1913 and his subsequent exhibiting with the Vorticists. From this early popularity, however, his reputation faltered after the First World War, when he became disillusioned with machine-age abstraction, and, instead experimented with naturalism, such as the surprisingly traditional *Jerusalem, Looking to Mount Scopus* of 1925.<sup>3</sup> By the 1930s he had alighted on his mature style, exemplified by *Portrait* of 1954 and *Vigilante* of 1955, which capture an intensely personal dialogue with his subjects.<sup>4</sup> This was largely unappreciated by gallerists and critics, however, and it

was only with the 1988 retrospective at Tate that he gained recognition as one of the most innovative and influential artists of his time. During his lean, post-Second World War years, Bomberg actively sought teaching. He applied to a number of institutions. He received his first break when the Bartlett School of Architecture allowed him to take over a drawing class (1945). This was followed by conducting drawing trips for students of University College and a temporary position at Dagenham School of Art, where he met two key members of the later Borough class, Dorothy Mead and Edna Mann as well as smaller engagements, such as the evening class at the City Literary Institute where he first met Cliff Holden.

It was here, however, at what was then the Borough Polytechnic that Bomberg was given a chance to delve into teaching substantively. And it is perhaps symbolically fitting that the art department was affiliated with the Bakery School, given Bomberg's advocacy of kneading into visual masses. Bomberg had developed a rapport with the art department head, Robert Patrick, during an unsuccessful application for a staff position. Bomberg was offered instead a part-time one in August 1945. He would teach two days and evenings a week in the white-tiled fourth floor room at the top of this building, though his hours were cut down to one day a week as early as 1948. Bomberg maintained as many simultaneous teaching engagements as he could at first, but it was during his eight years teaching here that he developed most as a teacher and found a community of enthusiastic students. And it was these students that assured the success of the class by spreading the word and recruiting others – sometimes even identifying kindred [spirits](#) while life modelling in other classes as a supplement to their incomes.<sup>5</sup> Bomberg lost his position in 1953, but by then he had inspired successive generations of students and become emblematic of an alternative to the restrictive, naturalistic methods taught elsewhere.

### **Structure of Class and Teaching**

The structure of the class was unremarkable in appearance, but radical in aims and the delivery of feedback. Each class was ostensibly a two-hour block. Despite the Borough Polytechnic offering certification, Bomberg's pupils were mostly drop-ins and only sporadically honoured the small fee asked by the greater Polytechnic. The classes were conventional in that they were life classes, involving painting and drawing by means of easels and desks arranged around a posed figure. However, imitation of nature, through observation and naturalistic replication, was passed over in favour of re-creating the experience of interacting with the model and the materials. The figure was not presented to pupils as an anatomical puzzle to be memorised, but as a dynamic subject to captured. Bomberg took great care in posing the model. A later student, Roy Oxlade, wrote that 'perhaps, if the model were sitting, he would ask her to get up and move around, only to stop her just as she was half-way between sitting and standing, to explain that she was now in a perfect pose'.<sup>6</sup> Light was also an element of enquiry. Cliff Holden describes Bomberg encouraging the class to work through varying natural and unnatural light conditions – from sunlight through the dusk and even into the dark.<sup>7</sup> Light was used, in Holden's words: '[to] reveal those changes in the related directions of the

form, which are the only factors which differentiate one form from another and give each its peculiar character'.<sup>8</sup> To 'differentiate one form from another' is a telling phrase. It assumes that spatial depth is an illusion, in other words I can only infer distance between objects because I have learnt to recognise certain visual cues as indicating where these objects lie in relation to myself. To differentiate forms from other forms is to decipher visual chaos by applying one's experiences as a body moving through space. This is why drawing teachers often encourage students to draw from numerous viewpoints. It is to learn how the forms interlink in three-dimensional space. Bomberg, in contrast, encouraged his students to make numerous drawings from a single viewpoint – pushing them to explore what happens as the mind tries to decipher visual cues, and, how one can pictorially express this struggle.

Oxlade has captured much information from his time as a student of Bomberg's within his later Masters and Doctoral theses at the Royal College of Art (1976, 1980), including the unconventional form of Bomberg's feedback. One passage in particular is worth quoting a length for the picture of the class experience that it paints:

Bomberg set up the pose, and the students chose a place and started to work. Then after everyone had got started, Bomberg went round giving advice and encouragement. A lot of his teaching was done by talking and gesture, which he did very quietly and individually. In place of the usual teacher's demonstration on drawing showing the student how to get it right, Bomberg showed an interest in reality from the student's point of view. But he was not prepared to sanction indiscriminate attempts at unstructured personal vision, and did in fact, on occasions make a diagram on the side of a student's work. He did this once in my own case during a life class. He looked at my drawing and then at the model, and after doing this several times more, he drew in pencil, very lightly two dome shapes one above the other and said 'the dome of St. Paul's is like this and not like this'.<sup>9</sup>

As Oxlade goes on to emphasise, the key element in this is that Bomberg paid particular attention to the terms that each individual student was working within. Part of this was also a fear of contamination – endeavouring to use lyricism and evocation to stimulate the student rather than risk encouraging that student to emulate Bomberg's own vision. Sometimes this came in the form of rhapsody, including the visual analogy Oxlade described, and sometimes it came in the form of poetry; regardless, the emphasis was on striking and maintaining the sensitivity and intensity of engagement necessary to become one with the work.<sup>10</sup> Such individualism could have led to lax permissiveness, but as Oxlade wrote: 'Bomberg did not tolerate unstructured personal vision – generalities would not do. Bomberg believed one must be specific, but specific according to one's own idea.'<sup>11</sup> And in order to stimulate a given student towards structure, Bomberg sometimes drew or painted onto a student's picture (with his-or-her permission). Bomberg did not work on his own paintings in the class, which has led his biographer, Richard Cork, to

speculate that the iconic photograph of Bomberg at an easel within the Borough class was a demonstration on a student's piece.<sup>12</sup> One student, Richard Michelmore asked Bomberg to co-sign one of his canvases as a result of this feedback, thus giving birth to a collaborative piece resulting from the painted dialogue between teacher and student.<sup>13</sup>

### **Content of Teaching: the Approach**

Collaboration brings me to one of the more contentious aspects of Bomberg's legacy: what was actively taught rather than imparted through individual feedback.

Bomberg did not promote a particular style, at least not directly, but rather policed an attitude towards the process of creation.<sup>14</sup> This is often called 'the approach' or, more often the search for the 'spirit in the mass'. This is not a simple concept because it was meant to stimulate non-verbal responses. His students and Bomberg, himself, all described it slightly differently. I want to give you a sampling of these descriptions, which range from poetic to practical.

Oxlade called the 'spirit in the mass': 'a "general poetic concept", where "mass", "scale", or "measure" in Bomberg's approach is what feels right according to the total response of the "nervous system".'<sup>15</sup> Thus 'the approach' is not so much a technique or style as it is a habit that can be trained – a sense of sensual and creative integrity. Creffield describes it terms of morality: '[Bomberg] never taught a style of drawing but tried to help the students to aim in the right direction – to develop – a moral disposition – the artist as a man'.<sup>16</sup> Among Bomberg's unpublished papers are notes about how morality is connected to art making as well, including the following:

There is inherent in the structure of moral values an integrity which performs but does not think. It will help sustain strength – the seat of which may be located in the mind; it cannot be seen but we know it is there, because it is operative. The desire for truth radiates from it. It becomes Fine Art when it is integrated with form. Not to possess it is to know you are no artist and for an artist to possess [\[sic\]](#) it and to sacrifice by compromise for expediency is to degrade the artist.<sup>17</sup>

How this integrity can be transformed into making a picture is difficult to pin down. If mass is some order within the chaos that confronts our vision, then integrity is merely a metaphor for an artistic counterpart – an artistic integrity that is only discernable in practice. Integrity then is another way of simply encouraging students to pay close attention to the external subject, rather than to abstract from their imaginations, as Bomberg did in his youth. Another note found in Bomberg's papers, puts this more clearly: 'Our approach to mass preserves our humanity – it is more of the spirit and less of the machine'.<sup>18</sup> In practical terms, this humanistic approach was, for Roy Oxlade: 'the return of art making to a basic language where art and nature achieve synthesis; where shared physical experience and invented form are held in creative tension.'<sup>19</sup> Or, it was, according to Holden, the melting of the artist

into the creative act, where the artist becomes one with the spirit through participating with the mass.<sup>20</sup> Creffield has similarly commented of his own work: 'I draw unaware – at one with what I'm drawing.'<sup>21</sup>

In other words, the approach was a lyrical challenge to hone a personal relationship with one's subject and the process of making. In the most reductive terms, it was a rigorously observed picture making that disavowed recreating optical illusion. The only substantive criterion was the respect for the body as a conduit for conveying and processing experience. In Oxlade's words again, it is 'to compose *about* life'.<sup>22</sup>

### **Context: Other Life Classes**

Let us step out from this inner circle for a moment and consider the broader context of the classes. Life classes in art education would soon all but disappear, not just Bomberg's, as trends in art education moved away from working from live models. This was exacerbated by waves of reforms that swept over tertiary art education throughout the 1960s. These reforms were responses to the recommendations of an advisory council to the Minister of Education chaired by William Coldstream (thus often called the Coldstream Council) and created the organisation that underlies the current art educational system.<sup>23</sup>

The slow strangulation of the life class was a by-product of drawing losing its status as a foundational literacy, replaced by 'Basic Design', which is type of training in basic forms and colours commonly associated with the Bauhaus's *Vorkurs* and in Britain with Victor Pasmore and Richard Hamilton's teaching at Newcastle University (as you will no doubt hear much more about at Gill Hedley's talk here on the 25<sup>th</sup> of May).<sup>24</sup> Basic design, like Bomberg's approach, sought to revitalise art education: stepping away from replicating a specific figurative tradition and instead bringing the innate faculties of perception back into art education.

Bomberg's classes are often discussed in dialectical terms as a counterpart to 'academic' life classes at the Slade in particular. The letter from Dorothy Mead displayed in the exhibition here is emblematic of this contrast.<sup>25</sup> It is important, however, to remember that these two schools were merely two among many. Most art schools were pitched primarily towards diploma programmes for producing designers and teachers and therefore were taught primarily by certified art teachers rather than practicing artists. But a trend was developing for 'real artists' to teach, and Bomberg was among them. So too were William Johnstone at Camberwell, William Coldstream at the Slade and Peter Lanyon at the Bath Academy of Art. And like Johnstone, Coldstream and Lanyon, Bomberg was not focused on applied art but on producing artists.<sup>26</sup>

It is important to remember that while Bomberg was teaching many art schools apart from a narrow elite were subject to centrally administered examinations, which treated drawing as a utilitarian skill, which could be measured in how well a student could render objects, geometry and work with memory and all of which needed to be mastered before a student could progress onto painting.<sup>27</sup> A flavour of this criteria

is evident in this examiners report of 1958 to the Ministry of Education complaining of the deficiency in drawing, especially in its emphasis on: 'the lack of capacity for objective observation or of the ability to transpose it effectively.'<sup>28</sup> A recent Tate research initiative into art education has labelled this period 'The Local Authority Era', when a large number of mostly small institutions were authorised to issue certificates under the supervision of local boards of education that offered a mix of fine art, technical and craft training.<sup>29</sup> Bomberg's class was able to operate outside this accountability through its unconcern with diplomas and thus in its own, idiosyncratic way, it remained in dialogue with other, exempted and elite, institutions also committed to producing practicing painters and sculptors, such as Bomberg's alma mater, that bastion of the tradition of life drawing, the Slade.

Though Coldstream's method of teaching his pupils to carefully measure between points on the model that are transferred to the page with as little manipulation as possible appears antithetical to Bomberg's approach, it was merely another means of applying rigorous integrity to image-making as well as casting off the conventions of memory training and anatomy elsewhere lumbered upon drawing.<sup>30</sup>

What was dominant elsewhere was a much more conventional sense of art education. Here we see demonstration drawings by Vivian Pitchforth, who had taught extensively across London from the 1920s to the 1970s.<sup>31</sup> Pitchforth's careful notation of the three main masses of the body – the head, thorax and pelvis – as geometric shapes arranged in relation to single point perspective and checked by use of plumb lines, embodies the how-to-get-it-right mentality of drawing instruction. The body is set convincingly in illusionistic, three-dimensional space with the contour lines didactically picked out to illustrate the pull of mass by gravity and distance.

In the late 1950s there were some artists, such as Victor Pasmore, who were shunning the life class entirely. There was also a new generation of life class teachers emerging. In the Bath Academy of Art at Corsham, Adrian Heath, who had begun to teach there in 1956, hung a roll of paper, which ran continuously round the studio walls. His models walked about never stopping while students drew them in motion without lifting their hands from the paper.<sup>32</sup> Vision and sense were also emphasised in a key text by Maurice de Sausmarez, *Basic Design: the Dynamics of Visual Form* (1964), where he wrote that:

[Analytical life drawings] should be made by all accumulations of marks made as instantaneous reaction to the experience of watching figures moving about; the marks should be made at speed and without deliberation should, nevertheless, be genuine attempts to grasp a fragment of contour, a directional movement, a point of pivotal emphasis, a 'felt' mass, the rise and fall of the shapes, the intuited flow.<sup>33</sup>

This was most famously applied in Harry Thubron's life drawing classes, where up to five models wandered the space, stepping over and around the students working on the floor. In several videos produced of in the 1960s Thubron's students match the pace of their hands to jazz music.<sup>34</sup> Heath, de Sausamarez and Thubron all sought to stimulate their students by disrupting normal artist-model relationships.<sup>35</sup>

What set Bomberg apart was his anticipation of the phenomenological approaches to life drawing as deeply subjective and yet, he stimulated this empathic creativity in his students without the gimmicks of movement or audacious poses. The only recourse was into the self to stimulate the picture. In the words of Dennis Creffield, who later worked alongside Thubron:

Contrary to common opinion, there was nothing of expressionism in [Bomberg's] teaching ... His classes were orthodox in form – no coloured lights or moving models – no contrived excitement. The student had to learn to conjure his own magic.<sup>36</sup>

### School of Bomberg

Let us step one ring further out. Twentieth century British art education is noted for its promotion of critical self-awareness. The incorporation of art history and theoretical studies into art curricula after the 1960s reforms stimulated a facility for self-promotion that understood the market preference for the artist as a mythic individualist, akin to a Romantic hero, who endeavours to be 'authentic' in an inauthentic world and who demonstrates this individualism through her refusal of the mainstream.<sup>37</sup> From the 1960s onwards artists increasingly exploited the marketability of this myth, so that by 1997, when the Young British Artists (or YBAs) held their *Sensation* exhibition at the Royal Academy, the image of the successful artist as an entrepreneur and provocateur had been firmly consolidated.

The opposite of this image was to knowingly work in the style of another artist, which was regarded as a lack of maturity, a confusion of self that amounted to a lack of integrity. This is encapsulated by Coldstream's lament:

However confusing the art student of to-day may find his world I think it is slightly easier for him to find a consistent line of development than it was for students of twenty-five years ago [...] Students of such strongly marked personal talents as Pasmore and Moynihan, even after they had been painting some years, were doing Braques one week, Sickerts the next and Derains the week after.<sup>38</sup>

A part of maintaining stylistic autonomy, or, Coldstream's 'consistent line of development', was to reject any debts to one's teachers. Yet when the teacher is as stubbornly nonconformist as Bomberg, the relationship between student and teacher, style and personal development, becomes further complicated as Frank Auerbach reflected in a 1978 interview:

The thing that I knew was that one's teachers were going to be silly fools and that one was going to rebel against them. I went to Bomberg's class where he said to me, 'Oh so you think I'm a silly old idiot don't you?', or something like that, and I said in my...arrogance, 'Yes I do.' He was delighted and I didn't realise that I had met with probably the most original, stubborn, radical intelligence that was to be found in art schools. It wasn't his phrases that made sense to me, because my relationship to teaching was one of rejection and rebellion. I mean, by itself and whether I was consciously aware of it or not, the status of the disciple seemed to me to be a totally futile one ... it was his practical instruction rather than his maxims which registered.<sup>39</sup>

It was this personal attention – the practical instruction, as Auerbach called it – that set Bomberg's classes apart and cut through rebellion-for-rebellion's sake. Yet this personal attention is inextricable from the personal dynamics of the class as a group.

Bomberg was intimately involved with his students. He did not do as Pitchforth advocated and police the borders between the identity of student and of teacher.<sup>40</sup> This is evident in the collaborative painting with Michelmore just as it is in Bomberg's fierce advocacy of his students. The strongest example is his participation in the London County Council's open-air exhibition at the Embankment Gardens (1948), where Bomberg sat with his and his students' work among the amateurs, exposed to the elements and peddling the pieces to the passers-by.

The pugilist dynamism that helped him to pierce an impoverished childhood and gain acclaim in an elitist art world here is channelled into a being one with his students. This is again reflected in the structure of his classes. Although he was the teacher, he not only took pains to emphasise the individuality of his students but also treated them with respect them as artists. And when he travelled – to Devon, Cornwall, Cyprus and Spain – his classes continued back in London, left to their own devices, to push at the bounds of their development. The class therefore became something more like a Renaissance 'school' in the sense of Ghiberti and Vasari, where a community coalesced around an elder artist's workshop, learning through practice and motivating each other to strive.

Another, less flattering way of considering this structure is that generations of teachers and pupils followed one another through a process of emulation. So that all the pictures looked the same. It is this taint of emulation that stigmatises those who gathered in Bomberg's classes: called 'Bombergians', 'Bombergists', 'the Bomberg Movement', 'the school of thick paint'. Pupils from Bomberg's classes do share superficial aesthetic affinities with each other and with Bomberg's mature manner – as we can see from these two paintings in the exhibition by Creffield and Holden – and such an aesthetic later became a recognisable and radical presence in the Slade during the 1960s.<sup>41</sup>

Creffield has argued against this tendency to conflate a style with teaching, telling an interviewer that 'the school of thick paint which is often attributed to [Bomberg] does not derive from his teaching but is the personal characteristic of certain artists who attended his class – or who have been taught by [his students].'<sup>42</sup> A nature or nurture fallacy emerges: did the aesthetically predisposed gather around Bomberg or did Bomberg inspire, intentionally or not, aesthetic similarity? To frame the question in these terms, however, is to fall into the myth of regarding the rebel and the emulator as polar opposites.

In looking to Bomberg's classes, it is more productive to recognise how the relationships therein transcended this debate. Individuality and community were not diametrically opposed. Cliff Holden is a case in point. He seized upon the intimacy Bomberg offered the early class and nurtured the formation of a group from among its most dedicated participants.<sup>43</sup> His political and social anarchism, rooted in a conception of mediaeval craft communities, was opposed to the modern ideal of the solitary rebel. He believed that modernism – pushing ever-further into originality and questioning materials – need not be a lonely activity but a communal one. This harkens back to older notions of anarchy, popularised by intellectuals, such as the critic and art writer Herbert Read in the 1930s. Only through harmonising the demands of the ego with that of the community, could the freedom necessary for personal fulfilment be achieved on both an individual and societal level.

Bomberg's concern for integrity and method over stylistic outcome resonates with this approach, just as the trust and one-ness he shared with his students facilitated a more democratic rather than conventional teacher-student relationship. Bomberg was a leader among equals.

Gifted with hindsight we need to step away from the school-versus-individual view, and instead look to how Bomberg set himself as a peer, a more experienced peer, but a peer nonetheless and in doing so, created a community in the classroom that did not just question the conventions of teaching structure and content, but also challenged the orthodoxies around what it meant to be an artist in the modern age.

**This paper by was commissioned as part of the public programme to accompany the exhibition, "Keep the Paint Moving": David Bomberg and the Art of Radical Teaching, and was presented as a talk at Borough Road Gallery on Thursday 28 April, 2016. Text © Kate Aspinall 2016**

---

<sup>1</sup> Arthur Stambois, Letter to David Bomberg (15 July 1945), collection of artist's family, quoted in Richard Cork, *David Bomberg* (London: Yale University Press, 1987), 260.

<sup>2</sup> David Bomberg, *In the Hold* (c.1913–4), oil paint on canvas, 196.2 x 231.1 cm, Tate, London; and David Bomberg, *The Mud Bath* (1914). Oil on canvas, 152.4 x 224.2 cm, Tate, London.

<sup>3</sup> David Bomberg, *Jerusalem, Looking to Mount Scopus* (1925), oil paint on canvas, 56.5 x 75.2 cm, Tate, London.

<sup>4</sup> David Bomberg, *Portrait* (1954), oil paint on board, 72 x 59 cm, Borough Road Gallery Collection, London; and David Bomberg, *Vigilante* (1955), oil paint on board, 71.8 x 60 cm, Tate, London.

<sup>5</sup> Dennis Creffield, conversation with author (21 April 2016).

<sup>6</sup> Cork, *Bomberg*, 289. Roy Oxlade recounted: 'the pose was important, and Bomberg took a great deal of trouble to find one, which was expressive of movement or tension. Roy Oxlade, 'Bomberg and the Borough: An Approach to Drawing' (MA diss. Royal College of Art, London, 1976), 227.

<sup>7</sup> Cliff Holden, 'David Bomberg: an artist as teacher', *Studio International* 173:887 (March 1967), 142. Full quotation: 'In working from the model he always encouraged the students to work in a variety of lights; it didn't matter if the sun came into the room, and often we worked into the dusk and even when it was dark. In this way we gained complete understanding of the form. We used light to reveal those changes in the related directions of the form, which are the only factors, which differentiate one form from another and give each its peculiar character. We worked towards what Bomberg called 'the spirit in the mass.' Dennis Creffield quoted in Cork, *Bomberg*, 289.

<sup>8</sup> Holden, 'An artist as teacher', 142.

<sup>9</sup> Oxlade, 'Bomberg and the Borough', 234.

<sup>10</sup> Dennis Creffield, *The Invisible Recorder: Dennis Creffield at Three East Anglian Cathedrals*, dir. Charles Mapleston, A Malachite Production for Anglia Television, 1989.

<sup>11</sup> Oxlade, 'Bomberg and the Borough', 234.

<sup>12</sup> Cork, *David Bomberg*, 290. Bomberg demonstrating to a student in his life class at the Borough Polytechnic (1947/8), photograph, Tate Archive, 20057/2/2.

<sup>13</sup> David Bomberg and Richard Michelmore, *Recto Messiah, Verso Messiah*, 1953, oil paint on board, 60.9 x 92.5, Tate, London. For description of Michelmore's collaboration, see Cork, *David Bomberg*, 290-1. Michelmore as requesting the signing, referenced by Creffield, conversation with author (21 April 2016).

<sup>14</sup> Furthermore, Bomberg's rarely working on his own pieces in class and his lack of gallery representation made his presentation works difficult for students to observe his pieces. The exception was the few pieces he would have in the annual London Group exhibitions. Creffield, conversation with author (21 April 2016).

<sup>15</sup> Roy Oxlade, 'Bomberg's Papers: The Spirit in the Mass' (PhD diss., Royal College of Art, 1980), 143.

<sup>16</sup> Creffield in conversation with Cork (11 April 1985), quoted in Cork, *Bomberg*, 271. This is comparable to an earlier precedent, such as John Fothergill writing in 1907: 'In sculpture, painting and drawing there are three elements: the spiritual or "literary" element (viz., that which represents the relation between man and man), and those of colour and form. These three elements represent three corresponding emotions in our life and reflection and sensation. A draughtsman, like the sculptor and painter, can express, even if only by analogy or symbol, the spiritual emotion. All such expression, however, must be dictated by the draughtsman's own character, so it is not the power of the drawing master to teach it. But inasmuch as the emotion of the forms and colours of nature are derived from material and visible things, it is reasonable to suppose that upon this common basis there can be constructed a principle of teaching which may be of real assistance to the student.' John Fothergill, 'The Principles of Teaching Drawing at the Slade School', in *The Slade: A Collection of Drawings and some Pictures done by Past and Present Students of the London Slade School of Art 1893-1907*, (London: Slade School, 1907), 31.

<sup>17</sup> David Bomberg, 'The Bomberg Papers', X: *A Quarterly Review*, ed. David Wright and Patrick Swift, 1:3 (June 1960), 186.

<sup>18</sup> Bomberg, *Blue Papers* 6.13; quoted in Oxlade, 'Bomberg's Papers', 44.

<sup>19</sup> Roy Oxlade, 'Bomberg's Papers', xxxi

<sup>20</sup> Cliff Holden, 'Bomberg's Teachings – Some Misconceptions', Cliff Holden, personal website (2005) [http://www.cliffholden.co.uk/documents\\_2004\\_30.shtml#spi](http://www.cliffholden.co.uk/documents_2004_30.shtml#spi), accessed 25 January 2016.

<sup>21</sup> And, that 'a drawing is very much like the keyboard of an instrument – the instrument with which you're making your image.' Creffield in *Invisible Recorder*.

<sup>22</sup> Oxlade paraphrasing Bomberg's Blue Papers, 6.8; quoted in Oxlade, 'Bomberg's Papers', 42.

<sup>23</sup> Kate Aspinall, 'The "Pasmore Report"?: Reflections on the 1960 "Coldstream Report" and its Legacy' (paper presented at *Art School Educated* conference, Tate Britain, London, September 12, 2014).

<sup>24</sup> Pasmore and Hamilton's course was memorialized in the 'The Developing Process' exhibition of 1959 held at the Hatton Gallery, Newcastle, and afterwards shown at the Institute of Contemporary Arts (ICA) in London. See also: David Thistlewood, *A Continuing Process: The New Creativity in British Art Education 1955-65*, exh. cat. (London: Institute of Contemporary Arts, 17 March – 19 April 1981), 4-10.

<sup>25</sup> Mead argued against the need for her to pass an exam in perspective in order to graduate and she was supported by an additional letter from Cliff Holden to Coldstream. Dorothy Mead, letter to William Coldstream (30 April 1959), UCL Archive, London; and Cliff Holden, letter to William Coldstream (29 June 1959), UCL Archive, London.

<sup>26</sup> For more on the self-conscious creation of artists rather than teaching art-techniques see: Alexander Massouras, 'Patronage, Professionalism and Youth: the Emerging Artist and London's Art Institutions 1949-1988' (PhD diss., Birkbeck, University of London, 2013).

<sup>27</sup> See: Ashwin, Clive, *Art Education documents and policies 1768-1975* (London: Society for Research into Higher Education, 1975), 66; and Stuart MacDonald, *A Century of Art and Design Education: From Arts and Crafts to Conceptual Art* (Cambridge: Lutterworth Press, 2005), 190, 196.

<sup>28</sup> Ministry of Education, Examinations in Art – 1958, Reports by the Assessors, Pictorial Group, National Archives, London, ED 206/46, p. 11.

<sup>29</sup> The other categories are: the Polytechnic Era 1965-1992 (Council for National Academic Awards) and the University Era post-1992 (H and FE Act Degree awarding powers). Nigel Llewellyn, 'Introduction', *The London Art Schools: Reforming the Art World, 1960 to Now*, ed. Nigel Llewellyn with Beth Williamson (London: Tate Publishing, 2015), 12.

<sup>30</sup> Bomberg is often discussed as a ideological counterpoint to William Coldstream's manner of rendering nudes through measuring between points, which attempted to minimise contamination of the imagination or preconceived knowledge, taught first at the Euston Road School in 1937, then at Camberwell in 1945, and finally becoming associated with the Slade when he became principal there in 1948. While this is true, there are strong continuities in their approaches – both wanted to pierce conventions of imposing upon experience and both were developing a sense of artist-personal integrity inculcated in them as students of Henry Tonks at the Slade. Additionally 'life drawing' was a relatively new phenomenon, becoming acceptable in art education only with the apotheosis of Frederic Leighton and waning again in the aftermath of the 1960s reforms when 'basic design'. See Stuart MacDonald, *The History and Philosophy of Art Education* (Cambridge: Lutterworth Press, 1970), 174-5; and Thistlewood, *A Continuing Process*.

<sup>31</sup> Roland Vivian Pitchforth, *Seated Model* (c.1950–60), ink and pastel on paper, 32.5 x 25.4 cm, Tate, London; and illustrations from Mervyn Levy in 'Draughtsman without Portfolio', *Studio International*, 163:825 (January 1962) 14-18. Pitchforth taught at Camberwell since 1926, the St Martin's School of Art since 1930, the Chelsea Polytechnic since 1948, Clapham from 1926 to 1939 and the Royal College of Art from 1937 to 1939.

<sup>32</sup> Margaret Garlake, *The Drawings of Peter Lanyon* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2003), 60.

<sup>33</sup> Maurice de Sausmarez, *Basic Design: the Dynamics of Visual Form* (Studio Vista, 1967), 74.

<sup>34</sup> Held at the National Arts Education Archive, Yorkshire Sculpture Park, Wakefield.

<sup>35</sup> See Hester Westley, 'The Many Lives of the Life Room' in *London Art*, 50-74.

<sup>36</sup> Dennis Creffield, conversation with Richard Cork (11 April 1985); quoted in Cork, *Bomberg*, 271.

<sup>37</sup> See Elizabeth Wilson, who wrote that 'Bohemia is the name for the attempt in nineteenth and twentieth century artist, writers, and intellectuals and radicals to create an alternative world without Western society (and possibly elsewhere).' Elizabeth Wilson, *Bohemians: The Glamorous Outcasts* (London: Tauris Parke, 2003), 2. See also: Jim McGuigan, who following Herbert Marcuse's theory of 'the Great Refusal' positions post-industrial art as a cycling between refusal and incorporation – amounting to research into cool rhetoric for advertisers. Jim McGuigan, *Cool Capitalism* (London: Pluto Press, 2009), 45-9, 77.

<sup>38</sup> William Coldstream, Untitled typescript draft of article about the Euston Road School, Tate Archive, 8922.9.16.

<sup>39</sup> Frank Auerbach, interview with Catherine Lampert in the catalogue of *Frank Auerbach*, an exhibition held at the Hayward Gallery, London, May-July 1978, 20; also reprinted in Catherine Lampert, *Frank Auerbach: Speaking and Painting* (London: Thames and Hudson, 2015), 27.

<sup>40</sup> Levy's paraphrase: 'preferring to keep separate in every way the identity of student and teacher'. Levy, 'Draughtsman without Portfolio', 12.

<sup>41</sup> Dennis Creffield, *Seated Nude* (1949), acrylic on board, 78 x 61 cm, Borough Road Gallery Collection; and Cliff Holden, *Seated Form B* (1960), oil on board, 122.5 x 92 cm, Borough Road Gallery Collection. For the influence at the Slade, see: Bruce Laughton, *William Coldstream* (London: Yale University Press, 2004), 195.

<sup>42</sup> Quoted in Cork, *David Bomberg*, 271.

<sup>43</sup> Creffield has attributed any organizing to Cliff, saying that Bomberg was not very organized or practical. Conversation with author (21 April 2016).

## Bibliography

- Ashwin, Clive. *Art Education: Documents and Policies 1768-1975*. London: Society for Research into Higher Education, 1975.
- Aspinall, Kate. 'The "Pasmore Report"?: Reflections on the 1960 "Coldstream Report" and its Legacy'. Paper presented at *Art School Educated* conference, Tate Britain, London, September 12, 2014.
- Auerbach, Frank. 'Fragments from a Conversation', *X: A Quarterly Review*, ed. David Wright and Patrick Swift, 1:1 (Nov 1959): 31-34.
- Bomberg, David. 'The Bomberg Papers', *X: A Quarterly Review*, ed. David Wright and Patrick Swift, 1:1 (June 1960): 183-190.
- Cork, Richard. *David Bomberg*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1987.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 'Creffield's Cathedrals' in *French Cathedrals: Drawings by Dennis Creffield*, exh. cat. London: Albermale Gallery, 1991.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 'Introduction' in *David Bomberg: Spirit in the Mass*, exh. cat. Kendal: Abbot Hall Art Gallery, 2006.
- Chambers, Emma. 'Slade School Influences on the Camden Town Group 1896-1910', in *The Camden Town Group in Context*, eds. Helena Bonett, Ysanne Holt, Jennifer Mundy. Tate Research Publication, May 2012, <https://www.tate.org.uk/art/research-publications/camden-town-group/emma-chambers-slade-school-influences-on-the-camden-town-group-1896-1910-r1104373>, accessed 10 April 2016.

- 
- Creffield, Dennis. 'The Project' in *English Cathedrals*, exh. cat. London: Southbank Centre, 1987.
  - \_\_\_\_\_, in conversation with Lynda Morris. *Dennis Creffield: a Retrospective*, exh. cat. London: Flowers Art Gallery, 2005.
  - \_\_\_\_\_. *The Invisible Recorder: Dennis Creffield at Three East Anglian Cathedrals*, dir. Charles Mapleston, A Malachite Production for Anglia Television, 1989.
  - de Duve, Thierry. 'When Form Has Become Attitude – And Beyond' in *The Artist and the Academy: Issues in Fine Art Education and the Wider Cultural Context*, ed. Nicholas de Ville and Stephen Foster. Highfield: University of Southampton and John Hansard Gallery, 1994.
  - Fothergill, John. 'The Principles of Teaching Drawing at the Slade School', in *The Slade: A Collection of Drawings and some Pictures done by Past and Present Students of the London Slade School of Art 1893–1907*. London: Slade School, 1907.
  - Garlake, Margaret. *The Drawings of Peter Lanyon*. Aldershot: Ashgate, 2003.
  - Hallman, Lee. 'Curving Round: David Sylvester and the 'Rediscovery' of David Bomberg', *Tate Papers*, 21 (Spring 2014) <http://www.tate.org.uk/research/publications/tate-papers/21/curving-round-david-sylvester-and-th-rediscovery-of-david-bomberg>, accessed 10 April 2016.
  - Holden, Cliff. 'David Bomberg: an artist as teacher', *Studio International* 173:887 (March 1967): 136-142
  - \_\_\_\_\_. 'The History of the Borough Group'. Cliff Holden website, 2004: [http://www.cliffholden.co.uk/documents\\_2004\\_10.shtml](http://www.cliffholden.co.uk/documents_2004_10.shtml) , accessed 10 January 2016.
  - \_\_\_\_\_. 'Bomberg's Teachings – Some Misconceptions', Cliff Holden website, 2005: [http://www.cliffholden.co.uk/documents\\_2004\\_30.shtml#spi](http://www.cliffholden.co.uk/documents_2004_30.shtml#spi) , accessed 25 January 2016.
  - Hughes, Robert. *Frank Auerbach*. London: Thames & Hudson, 1990.
  - Lampert, Catherine. *Frank Auerbach: Speaking and Painting*. London: Thames and Hudson, 2015.
  - Laughton, Bruce. *William Coldstream*. London: Yale University Press, 2004.
  - Levy, Mervyn. 'Draughtsman without Portfolio', in *Studio International*, 163:825 (January 1962): 14-18.
  - Llewellyn, Nigel. 'The History of Western Art History' in *Companion to Historiography*, ed. Michael Bentley. London: Routledge, 1997.
  - \_\_\_\_\_, ed. *The London Art Schools: Reforming the Art World, 1960 to Now*. London: Tate Publishing, 2015.
  - Macdonald, Stuart. *A Century of Art and Design Education: From Arts and Crafts to Conceptual Art*. Cambridge: Lutterworth Press, 2005.
  - \_\_\_\_\_. *The History and Philosophy of Art Education*. Cambridge: Lutterworth Press, 1970.
  - Massouras, Alexander. 'Patronage, Professionalism and Youth: the Emerging Artist and London's Art Institutions 1949-1988. PhD diss., Birkbeck, University of London, 2013.
  - McGuigan, Jim. *Cool Capitalism*. London: Pluto Press, 2009.
  - Mellor, David. *The Sixties Art Scene in London* (London: Phaidon in association with the Barbican Art Gallery, 1993).
  - Morris, Lynda, ed. *Henry Tonks and the 'Art of Pure Drawing'*, exh. cat. Norwich: Norwich School of Art Gallery, c1985.
  - Oxlade, Roy. 'Bomberg and the Borough: An Approach to Drawing'. MA diss. Royal College of Art, London, 1976.
  - \_\_\_\_\_. 'Bomberg's Papers: The Spirit in the Mass'. PhD diss., Royal College of Art, 1980.
  - de Saumarez, Maurice. *Basic Design: the Dynamics of Visual Form*. Studio Vista, 1967.
  - Thistlewood, David. *A Continuing Process: The New Creativity in British Art Education 1955-65*, exh. cat. London: Institute of Contemporary Arts, 17 March – 19 April 1981.
  - Trehwela, Paul. 'The Borough Group in its Time and Now' in *Borough: David Bomberg and his Students at Borough Polytechnic*, exh. cat. London: Waterhouse & Dodd, 2015. Wilson, Elizabeth. *Bohemians: The Glamorous Outcasts*. London: Tauris Parke, 2003.